

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 219 074

IR 010 300

AUTHOR Boyer, Robin K.
TITLE An Annotated Bibliography of the Literature Dealing
with Textbook and Curriculum Censorship in the Public
Schools.
PUB DATE Apr 82
NOTE 48p.
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Freedom; Annotated Bibliographies;
*Censorship; *Curriculum; Elementary Secondary
Education; Literature Reviews; *Public Schools;
Teachers; *Textbooks

ABSTRACT

Undertaken to increase awareness among educators of the increasing problems of censorship in public schools and to inform them of some methods for avoiding controversies, this review of textbook and curriculum censorship uses annotations of more than 50 sources to present opposing sides of the question and present solutions. Divided into two parts, the first examines the censors, their reasons for attacking modern textbooks and curriculums, the views of those opposed to censorship, and the legal background for censorship. The second part presents strategies for educators to deal successfully with censorship in the future and is followed by a summary discussion, conclusions, and five practical recommendations for teachers. (RAA)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

• This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE LITERATURE DEALING WITH
TEXTBOOK AND CURRICULUM CENSORSHIP
IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

BY

ROBIN K. BOYER

Graduate Student

Study Directed

by

Charles R. DuVall, Ph.D.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robin K. Boyer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the course S591--exit requirement
Indiana University at South Bend
April, 1982

ED219074

IR010300

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Purpose of the Study	2
Organization of the Study	2
Definition of Terms	3
ANNOTATIONS	4
Censors and Their Opponents	4
The Censors and Their Objections	4
Opponents of Censorship and Their Views	10
Court Decisions on Censorship in Public Schools ...	17
Dealing With Censorship	19
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	29
Summary	29
Conclusions	35
Recommendations	38
BIBLIOGRAPHY	40

INTRODUCTION

In the past decade, censorship rose to prominence among public education's leading problems. Throughout the history of American education there have been differing views with respect to the control of materials used in the public schools. However, only in the past ten years did the actual problem of censorship within the public schools begin to swell.

The 1960's were a period of liberalization for all of society. Schools only reflect the society within which they operate, so schools also began to liberalize (Gaines:1:27). At the same time they began to modernize curriculum. Most of society was happy with this modernization of public school curriculum.

However, in the 1970's there occurred a conservative reaction. This included a movement for "back-to-basics" as well as criticism of liberal school curriculum. This conservative movement also manifested itself in the book bannings which began gathering public attention during the mid-1970's.

These textbook controversies were followed closely by the media, and gathered the attention of educators and the public alike. Despite all the attention, most Americans failed to realize that the question of censorship in the schools was of grave importance to all citizens whether they were taxpayers, parents, or educators.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

With censorship on the rise, educators became faced with increasing incidences of textbook and curriculum controversy. Educators were caught in the unpleasant position of trying to use the best materials available while at the same time trying to please an increasingly demanding public. Different segments of that public continued demanding their views be presented in the schools right along with popularly held views. This increasing demand by special interest groups inevitably led to the banning and censoring of textbooks and curriculum.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of the study was to increase awareness among educators of the increasing problem of censorship in the public schools and to make educators aware of some of the possible methods for avoiding such controversies.

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

The study was divided into two parts. The first part of the study examined the censors and their reasons for attacking modern textbooks and curriculum. Also in the first part of the study the views of those opposed to censorship and the legal background on censorship were given. The second part of the study then concentrated

on how educators could deal with censorship successfully in the future.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Censorship-- "To censor is to intentionally prevent someone from viewing and/or hearing meaningful verbal, graphic, dramatic, or sonic material for the purpose of protecting a preferred belief or attitude" (C. Benjamin Cox:313).

Censor-- "An official who examines publications for objectionable matter"(Webster's:135).

For the purpose of the study, the term was used to refer to anyone who agreed to the removal of material presently in the public schools for reasons other than obsolescence.

ANNOTATIONS

CENSORS AND THEIR OPPONENTS

The Censors and Their Objections

Arons, Stephen, "Bookburning in the Heartland," Education Digest, 45:11-14, December, 1979.

Arons studied the censorship controversy which took place in Warsaw, Indiana during 1977. He showed how a group of fundamentalist Christians, alarmed at some of the materials used in the schools, tried to ban certain books and change curriculum to suit their own values and morals. The media then further inflamed the situation until the hysteria had spread throughout a large portion of the population. The author felt the media coverage did a great deal more harm than good in this situation. Arons pointed out that parents have the right under the First Amendment to educate their children as they see fit. However, in the public schools the majority rules, making First Amendment rights virtually impossible. This paradox, according to the author, was the real heart of all censorship issues.

Blee, Thomas J., "A Case for Censorship," Indiana English, 1:28-33, Fall, 1977.

Blee took a different stand from many people on the issue of censorship. He argued that the First Amendment guaranteed freedom of speech and press, but not to the point where that spoken or printed word became nonpermissible. He felt that a certain degree of censorship was necessary and preferable to wide-open obscenity. He felt that schools should be very choosy about the materials used in the classroom setting. This author blamed much of the censorship problems on the schools for not being careful enough in choosing the materials used in the classroom.

Donelson, Ken, "Censorship Comes to Adolescent Literature," Indiana English, 1:10-14, Fall, 1977.

This article dealt with a new problem concerning censorship. Censorship at one time was associated only with controversial high school books, but books at the grade school level have received criticism lately. Most adolescent books used to deal only with noncontroversial subjects. As this changed, the opposition to many adolescent books increased. These books often disagreed with the ideology of right wing groups which attacked them. Then minority groups attacked any book which appeared offensive to anyone. Even adolescent textbooks were no longer immune to the attack of all these special interest groups. The author saw this as a dangerous trend. Censorship appeared to be the new way for groups to gain power.

Gaines, Ervin J., "The New Censorship--Social Responsibility and Moral Righteousness," Indiana English, 1:23-27, Fall, 1977.

The author claimed that freedom of expression on the area of sexual censorship had already been won in the 1960's. He argued that recent occurrences in sexual censorship were only local setbacks in the gradual social adjustment to this new freedom. He was more concerned about the development of political censorship, including the rewriting of history to suit present social conditions. Gaines complained that some people felt it was the schools' mission to clean up social injustices in all of society. He disagreed with this view and stated that schools could only reflect the society in which they existed.

Glatthorn, Allan, "Censorship and the Classroom Teacher,"
English Journal, 66:12-15, February, 1977.

Glatthorn claimed that most censorship attempts were being made mainly because the general public blamed schools and teachers for societal problems. He also noted that many middle class Americans felt they were quickly becoming a minority being attacked by many outside sources, including the schools. The author felt that many of these parents had good reason to be concerned. With the rapid growth of elective courses, the author stated that there had been a form of curriculum anarchy. He claimed that teachers and schools needed to do a better job of selecting materials truly appropriate to the classroom setting. He voiced concern that this had not always been done in the past.

Hentoff, Nat, "Censorship and the Schools," Learning,
 9:78-81, March, 1981.

Everyone had the potential to be a censor, according to Hentoff, and almost anything was potentially censorable. He noted that most censors were fundamentalists, but many people from all parts of society had become involved in censorship battles. Though all parents had the right to censor what their own children read, they had no right to censor what other children read. This violated First Amendment rights. If censorship were to continue, the author feared that future generations might come to accept censorship of expression as the norm. Hentoff warned that the present pastime of censorship might become an American way of life in the future.

Hillocks, George, Jr., "Books and Bombs: Ideological Conflict and the Schools--A Case Study of the Kanawha County Book Protest," School Review, 86:632-654, August, 1978.

Hillocks did an extensive study of this violent book protest in West Virginia. The author stated that the protestors tried to force their own values on the rest of the community by changing textbooks. He noted that the protestors were fundamentalists. These protestors believed that the schools deliberately opposed the values and morals of fundamentalist Christianity. In order to avoid such violence in the future, the author felt it might become necessary to change public education and set up schools to teach definite and sometimes opposing philosophies in order to give parents a real choice in their children's education.

Jenkinson, Edward B., "'Who Will Control the Minds of the Students' in Warsaw, Indiana?," Educational Resources Information Center, ED 168 067, Indiana Council of Teachers of English, Terre Haute, Indiana, November, 1978, 22pp.

This paper followed the censorship controversy which took place in 1977 in Warsaw, Indiana. The author implicated the true issue behind the whole event and struggle was really control of the schools. The nonelected school board felt it should have unlimited control in the schools. The author noted how the local newspaper was used by key members of the community to turn public opinion against those who opposed the board. The author noted that in the end the school board lost on all counts of the unfair labor practice suit filed by the local teacher's association. However, the author felt it was a hollow victory, because the basic problem was never resolved.

Kamhi, Michelle Marder, "Censorship vs. Selection--- Choosing the Books Our Children Shall Read," Educational Leadership, 39:211-215, December, 1981.

This article was based on a nationwide survey by the Association of American Publishers and the American Library Association. The author noted that most of the censors at the state level were organized groups, such as the Gablers. At the local level, censors tended to be individual parents or church groups. To avoid complaints by the community, the author suggested schools needed to develop formal procedures for adopting books which would allow public input. Kamhi also suggested formal procedures needed to be developed for handling complaints. The author felt the most important measure was a good public relations program with the community which would keep the public well informed.

Massie, Dorothy C., "Censorship in the Schools: Something Old and Something New," Today's Education, 69:56GE-60GE, November/December, 1980.

The author of this article recalled the burning of a book in 1650 in the city of Boston, stating that censorship was really nothing new. Massie worried that with censorship apparently on the rise there could be a very dangerous trend developing. Right wing critics of education had moved this direction in the past, but the author was concerned because of their increased success. She saw the radical right using censorship as a political tool to institute their own political and economic goals into the national agenda. The author warned that if these extremists gained too much attention educators would forget their obligations to the vast majority of students and parents who did not align themselves with the far right.

Parker, Barbara, "Your Schools May Be the Next Battlefield in the Crusade Against 'Improper' Textbooks," The American School Board Journal, 166:21-26, June, 1979.

This article gave an indepth view of Educational Research Analysts, Incorporated of Longview, Texas. Mel and Norma Gabler ran this nonprofit organization from their own home in their attempt to cleanse the schools of bad textbooks. The Gablers wanted equal time for strictly fundamental beliefs and values which they felt the country was founded on, and were against any type of inquiry approach to teaching. They were convinced that the only way to clean up society was to clean up textbooks. The author felt the Gablers were a powerful force in statewide book adoptions and several publishers admitted changing books to suit the Gablers.

Pearson, Craig, "The Enfield Uproar: Criticism or Censorship?" Learning, 9:36-38, October, 1980.

In this article the author looked at the details of a case which developed out of an objection made over a social studies textbook in Enfield, Connecticut. One parent wanted a few simple answers about the book in question and soon found herself embroiled in a controversey. A committee appointed by the superintendent eventually recommended to drop the book, but the superintendent disregarded their recommendation and kept the book in use. Throughout the entire article the author made it very clear that no one involved wanted any type of controversey to develop. Through a series of mishandlings and misunderstandings a major censorship case developed. The author warned that if policies for handling complaints were not handled properly and common sense used in such a case, any situation could evolve into an "Enfield uproar."

Segraves, Nell, J., "The Children of the Second Generation," Perspectives in Reading Series, International Reading Association, Inc., Newark, Delaware, 1979, pp. 32-37.

In this article the author attacked the schools for teaching the new state religion, secularism. The author also called this a new age of rebellion. Segraves felt that the majority of Americans were being educated in a philosophy hostile to religion. The author called for laws prohibiting indoctrination by requiring schools to present Biblical views along with secular views. Parents not only had the right to oversee the morals and values of their children, but also, according to the author, they had the responsibility to do so. Therefore, the author advocated tighter control over the schools by parents in order to maintain tighter control over the moral education of their children.

Yenser, Seymour, "Our Changing Censorship," Indiana English, 1:51-55, Fall, 1977.

Yenser stated that originally censorship was done out of a protectionist attitude. Students and adults needed to be protected from the wrong ideas. Now minority groups had entered the censorship scene trying to blot out such things as racism and sexism. The author admitted that a certain degree of indoctrination had always taken place in the schools, but schools were never set up to allow regular institutionalizing of some particular point of view. He advocated keeping many of the present textbooks and teaching them within their own context. If all biased materials were removed from schools, the author doubted there would be enough good materials left in the schools for students to receive even a minimal education.

Opponents of Censorship and Their Views

Farrell, Edmund J., "Literature Crisis in the Schools," Education Digest, 46:56-58, April, 1981.

Farrell saw a new crisis in literature which had risen with the onset of censorship. With censors attacking the classrooms full of "filth" and "un-American" ideas, the schools had been put on the defensive. Publishers reacted by avoiding controversial materials. Teachers began self-censorship to avoid complaints which too often caused teacher dismissals. The author failed to understand this because students had more access to morally questionable material outside of school than ever before. Farrell felt the treatment of the public schools when viewed in this light was a paradox. He argued that literature was education of the imagination and could only be done properly when both students and teachers were given freedom of expression as outlined in the First Amendment.

Hatcher, Thomas C., "Indoctrinate or Educate: An Educational Perspective on the Use of Materials," Perspectives in Reading Series, International Reading Association, Inc., Newark, Delaware, 1979, pp. 7-13.

This article was written as a defense of the educational process and the use of controversial materials in the schools. The author emphasized that schools were attempting to develop rational thinking individuals and not trying to indoctrinate children, as many parents apparently wanted the schools to do. He felt the public schools needed to reeducate the general public about the real foundation of education. Once the public really understood that schools only attempted to spur students on to higher thinking, he felt many parents would change both their outlook and their approach to public education.

Hung, Pham Thien, "Parents Protest Textbooks," Educational Resources Information Center, ED 170 749, Freedom of Information Center, Columbia, Missouri, March, 1979, 12 pp.

This study showed the increasing pace of censorship throughout the country. The biggest textbook force, according to the author, was the Gablers, who claimed that textbooks caused irreparable damage to students. Social unrest appeared to be the biggest single reason for the increased attacks on textbooks. The author recommended that educators meet the censors with understanding and compassion rather than brushing them aside. He noted that if society were really becoming that conservative, textbooks would probably show a definite conservative trend very soon. Textbooks tended to reflect the mood of society, according to Hung.

Jenkinson, Edward B., Censors in the Classroom: The Mind Benders, Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale, 1979, 184 pp.

Jenkinson showed the recent increase in censorship by documenting such attempts throughout the country. He warned that no books were safe, because different censors could find almost anything offensive. He noted that over two hundred organizations had participated in such attacks. One chapter devoted itself to the censors attack on "secular humanism," which the censors called a religion. The author showed great concern over the attack on the inquiry approach, which many parents wanted to drop in favor of "back to basics." His main objection was that, though each parent had a right to censor what his or her child read, censors did not have any right to censor what everyone else's children read. Jenkinson considered this unthinkable under the present Constitution.

Jones, Adrienne, "Values, Themes, and Censorship: The Writer's View," Perspectives in Reading Series, International Reading Association, Inc., Newark, Delaware, 1979, pp. 16-19.

Jones voiced concern about the affect censorship was having on the publishing industry. The banning of books killed creativity, because authors soon began avoiding controversial subjects. Publishers had the right to choose among different materials, but the author felt they did not have the right to censor materials as many of them were doing. The main theme of the article was that parents had the right to censor what their own children read, but they did not have the right to censor what everyone else's children read. The First Amendment prohibited censorship, and the author felt that was the way it should be. There should be no censorship.

Lettis, Richard, "The Book is Not For Burning," Journal of Reading, 21:106-108, November, 1978.

Lettis emphasized the point that one of the best ways for anyone to grow was to read. While the author felt there was no need to force absolute filth on our children in the public schools, he argued that these students needed to be allowed to read materials which would teach them to think. If students never read challenging or even controversial books, Lettis worried that they might never have the opportunity to develop into well-rounded individuals. Schools and teachers did not have the right to stop students from reaching out, and neither did the censors. If the schools did much more than advise and guide students, the author felt they were censoring material.

Mikulecky, Larry, "Censorship and Reading Instruction," Reading Teacher, 33:4-6, October, 1979.

In this article the author gave the statement of the Intellectual Freedom Committee, whose member organizations included the American Library Association, the National Council for Social Studies, the National Council of Teachers of English, the Speech Communication Association, the American Association of School Administrators, the National Education Association, the American Federation of Teachers, and the International Reading Association. The Committee was organized to provide ongoing investigations of censorship and to make educators aware of the problems involved. The Committee was to work in conjunction with the Academic Freedom Group to counter censorship and act as a clearinghouse for information on censorship. The Committee stood for the freedom of students to read and the freedom of teachers to teach.

Miller, Henry, "A Great Writer's View: Banning Books in Schools is 'Insane'," The American School Board Journal, 165:32-33, May, 1978.

Miller, author of Tropic of Cancer, was very upset at the very idea of censorship in public schools. He claimed the banning of books from schools was causing intellectual death to take place. He warned against allowing society to fall into another dark age. To avoid this, he felt children had to be taught to think freely. The whole basis of schools was not to turn out geniuses, who were few and far between. Instead schools were created to turn out freethinkers. Miller stated that it did not matter so much what students studied as long as they were free to grow and learn. He feared this would become impossible if books were banned and children could no longer read freely.

"National Council for Social Studies Position Statement on the Freedom to Teach and the Freedom to Learn,"
Educational Resources Information Center, ED 143
570, National Council for Social Studies, Washington, D.C., 1977, 2 pp.

This statement, formulated in 1974, gave the official view of the NCSS on censorship in schools. Teachers needed the right and the freedom to use the highest quality materials available. Students needed the right and freedom to study high quality materials. Censorship endangered these rights. The council called for community, teachers, and students to participate in selection of materials. The council claimed that all Americans needed to become well educated in order to maintain the democratic system which guaranteed the freedom to teach, the freedom to learn, and the freedom to think.

Rhode, Robert T., "Are Censors Confusing Humanism with Secular Humanism?", Indiana English, 1:56-61, Fall, 1977.

Rhode felt that the big controversy over secular humanism in the schools was for the most part a misunderstanding on the part of the general public. According to the secular humanists, there were no universal norms or absolute human values. They concerned themselves with the present rather than the past or future. Humanist philosophy in education strove "to help students feel and to care." The author noted the significant difference in the two philosophies. He felt it was unfair for the public to continue lumping these two philosophies into one category. He called for teachers to counter this attack on education.

Robinson, Stephen, "Freedom, Censorship, Schools, and Libraries," English Journal, 70:58-59, January, 1981.

In this article, the author argued that our society was based on individualism. This included the right of freedom of expression. At the same time, the author stated that each individual should respect the freedom of expression of other individuals. The censors did not practice this philosophy. The author claimed censorship was wrong because it was an attempt to keep people pure by keeping them ignorant. He wanted the government to become involved since the basic freedoms of the First Amendment were at stake. He called for governmental support for individuals who were attacked by censors. Robinson warned that if these rights were not protected, the very basis for democracy could someday be threatened.

Small, Robert C., Jr., "And then There Were None--Take It Away! I Don't Like It!", Language Arts, 54:244-249 March, 1977.

Small complained that many criticisms of textbooks were sincere, but based on total misinterpretations of those textbooks. In the case of literature books, the censors did not understand that books did not always teach true lessons, but sometimes taught through negativism. In order to combat this problem, the author wanted teachers to work hard to equip the students of this generation with the proper tools for interpreting books when they become parents. Small emphasized the importance of showing students and the public that books never existed only to preach. Many books were written to challenge the reader's beliefs and ideas so that the reader would really think about his or her values.

Spiewak, Craig A., "Don't Think That the Censors Will Ignore Peaceful Valley High School," Indiana English, 1:62-71, Fall, 1977.

This article was written from an interview with Edward Jenkinson. Jenkinson stated that censorship was on the rise for four reasons: parents did not recognize English as the same subject matter they had in school, many parents did not read and did not like to read contemporary literature, more and more organized groups had become involved in censorship, and schools had become easy targets for unhappy citizens who felt that if they had no power in anything else they could at least be heard at the local schools. Jenkinson warned that everyone should be concerned with censorship in the schools because it could eventually effect everyone's right to read and know the truth.

Court Decisions on Censorship in Public Schools

Edwards, June, "A New Twist to an Old Problem: Recent Court Decisions on School Book Censorship," English Journal, 70:50-53, March, 1981.

Edwards showed how the courts had changed direction in rulings on censorship. During the 1960's and 70's, the courts supported the liberal trend toward the use of contemporary literature in the schools. In the past few years courts became less concerned with the literary quality of works in question and became much more concerned with who has the right to select and remove those books. The author noted that the courts acknowledged academic freedom on the one hand, while ruling against this principle by giving school boards broad control in the handling of textbooks. Edwards felt this would only open the door wider for would be censors.

Edwards, June, "The Impact of Obscenity Legislation on Schools," The Educational Forum, 44:165-173, January, 1980.

This article dealt with the impact new obscenity legislation might have on the public schools. The states have been left to decide what is obscene using the "contemporary standards of the community" and the "average person" test. Since the courts had already affirmed that standards for minors should be much stricter than those for adults, the author cautioned that school personnel could be liable for criminal prosecution if classroom material were found obscene. With present laws so vague, Edwards warned that what may be obscene in one community may not be in another. The author showed concern over the uncertainty this left for all educators when choosing classroom materials.

Flygare, Thomas J., "The Zykan Case: A Triumph for School Board Authority," Phi Delta Kappan, 62:279, December, 1980.

Flygare gave a critical evaluation of the court case involving the banning of books and the dismantling of curriculum in Warsaw, Indiana. The Zykan's challenged the boards right to make such changes. The Zykan's argued that it was unconstitutional for board members to use their own social, moral, and political ideas and views when making educational decisions. The author felt it was a landmark case because, if the Zykans had won, the courts could easily control the schools. Any citizen who disagreed with a board decision could simply have the decision overturned by a court ruling. The author felt that the courts were already too deeply involved in the educational process and that the control of schools should remain in the hands of the local school boards.

Rhode, Robert T., "Legal Decisions and Censorship: A Game of Chance," Indiana English, 1:34-40, Fall, 1977.

The author showed convincing evidence that legal decisions dealing with censorship have left a very confusing trail. A few court decisions upheld the parent's rights to intercede in their children's use of textbooks. In other cases the courts upheld the teachers' battle for academic freedom. With no definite direction in the rulings of the courts, the author felt educators were left in a precarious position. The ruling likely to be handed down by a court might differ from one state to another, or even from one court to another within the same state. Rhode worried that court decisions on censorship appeared to be a game of chance.

Woods, L.B., "Is Academic Freedom Dead in Public Schools?,"
Phi Delta Kappan, 61:104-106, October, 1979.

Woods stated that the courts had only partially addressed the issue of academic freedom in the public schools. Since public schools were not founded for the purpose of original research, critics argued that the rights of academic freedom could not apply to public schools. Woods disagreed with this view and called for a reexamination of public schools. He felt that censorship would continue to focus on morals and values in textbooks. Therefore, the author argued that without academic freedom the trend toward increased censorship would continue. If this trend continued unchecked, the author foresaw a day when very little good material would be left for teachers to use.

DEALING WITH CENSORSHIP

Bull, Barry L., "The Constitution, Liberal Theory, and Textbook Bias," The Educational Forum, 45:147-162, November, 1979.

Bull claimed that the battle over textbook control was not a professional or public fad. Minority groups had won legal status and begun demanding that schools be forced to reflect their views also. Bull saw all kinds of complications for educators if every group in a community began demanding their views be reflected in the schools. He called for the courts and schools to use the "truth standard." This would be used to help ensure textbooks to be a "factually justifiable representation of races, ethnic groups, and sexes in mandatory classroom material." The author saw this as the only way to guarantee everyone's First Amendment rights in public schools.

Burress, Lee, "Censorship and Cultural Conflict," Indiana English, 1:15-18, Fall, 1977.

Burress contended that not all censorship should be regarded as evil. Instead, the author showed that it might have been one characteristic of a free society which was being misapplied. Burress saw this as a sure sign that more people were becoming involved in the democratic processes of government. More people felt their voices could be heard if they spoke up. Schools needed to use this involvement of the public to plan the future of education. If the needs of the constituents were kept in mind, the author claimed good books could be kept in the classroom through public relations and community involvement programs.

Cox, C. Benjamin, "The Censorship Game and How to Play It," Educational Resources Information Center, ED 143 570, National Council for Social Studies, Washington, D.C., 1977, 48 pp.

Cox suggested that censorship battles should be made into a game to provide the public with a new type of exciting sport. He wanted social studies teachers on one team and lay people on the other battling it out over different censorship issues. The author used this satire to explore alternatives to most censorship battles. He felt it was wrong for citizens or educators to use raw political power in such struggles. He called for the public and educators to come together in some rational fashion rather than opposing each other irrationally as most censorship battles had been fought in the past.

Cox, Gary, "Censorship: Tactics and Strategies,"
Indiana English, 1:5-7, Fall, 1977.

After considering the trend toward increased censorship, Cox expressed great concern for the future of English education. He called for schools to plan formal policies of book selection and for the handling of complaints about materials used in the classroom. He noted that many censors were individual parents that called in complaining about a book. The book was then quickly removed to avoid further complaints without any formal action taken. The author did not like complaints handled in such an informal manner. He admitted that the public had a right to complain, and noted that those complaints should not be discarded. However, Cox wanted to see these complaints go through a formal and well documented procedure before a book could be removed.

Donelson, Ken, "You Don't Need a Crystal Ball to Guess
 What's Going to Happen With Censorship," English
 Journal, 69:52-54, January, 1980.

In this article, Donelson recalled his first encounter with censorship as a young teacher. He then made some observations about what censorship trends seemed headed for. Censorship was generally arbitrary and oftentimes unpredictable. In most censorship battles, the censors saw only what they recognized as the truth, "God's truth" or "God's word." At times teachers became involved in censorship right alongside the censors. With so many people dissatisfied with society today, the author saw only an increase in censorship attempts in the future. He warned that teachers needed to prepare themselves so that they would not be caught by surprise as he had been a number of years ago as a young teacher.

Erickson, Lawrence G., "Closing the Adversary Gap,"
Perspectives in Reading Series, International
 Reading Association, Inc., Newark, Delaware, 1979,
 pp. 42-46.

The author expressed concern over the general lack of trust in public education. He noted that this distrust had grown into an adversary relationship between educators and the public. Such a relationship could prove to be dangerous, according to the author. He called for schools to begin a public relations campaign and begin building communications with parents. He felt it had become extremely important to get the public involved in education and help the public to better understand the problems of education. If nothing were done, the author claimed that further deterioration of public education was inevitable.

Hatcher, Thomas C., "Educational Directions in a Pluralistic Society," Perspectives in Reading Series, International Reading Association, Inc., Newark, Delaware, 1979, pp. 38-41.

The author noted that it would become increasingly difficult to please society with public education because of the great diversity in society. He suggested the following criteria for curricular decisions in the future. Schools needed to maintain democratic principles in decision making. Schools needed to deal with controversial issues to prepare students for the real world. Schools needed to allow more input from all concerned parties in the community. Groups which held views not accepted by the majority of society cannot expect institutions to automatically adopt their views. Schools needed to adopt an active role in the pluralistic society in modern America.

Heisner, J.D., "Censorship: The Fight Against It Goes On!",
Instructor, 88:24-25, January, 1979.

The author expressed concern about the rise in censorship attempts in recent years. The author was upset because censors used the rights guaranteed to all Americans under the Constitution to try and deprive many other people of those same rights. This, according to the author, was not the intent of the First Amendment. The author suggested schools needed to develop formal written procedures for selecting materials and for handling complaints. He noted that the parents had the right to complain, but felt they should be required to follow formal procedures. Heisner concluded that censorship was far from decided in the schools, but he promised that the fight against it would continue.

Jenkinson, Edward B., "An Editorial: The Organized Censors Rarely Rest," Indiana English, 1:3-4, Fall, 1977.

Jenkinson suggested that teachers should begin to work as hard at resisting censorship as the censors did at creating censorship. He wanted all schools to develop book selection policies, formal procedures for handling complaints about materials, and written statements of philosophy justifying the materials used. Before any controversial material should be used, the author noted that a written rationale should be developed for that piece of material before it is used in the classroom. If schools and teachers failed to do these things in the future, Jenkinson perceived a steady increase in the number of successful censorship attempts.

Josten, Monica L., "The Unlikely Censor," English Journal, 66:15-17, February, 1977.

Josten felt that many of the problems over censorship in the schools could have been avoided in the first place. She questioned the books used by some teachers in the classroom. She wanted teachers to use books tailored to the reading abilities of the students, called for preparation of students for the content in those books, and felt it essential to give students a choice of books from a list in their literature classes. She claimed this could be done without lowering the quality of selections. The author pointed out that flexibility was much easier than a censorship crisis. She ended by noting that the only way to protect First Amendment rights was to offer "variety and individual choice."

Lohr, Elaine, "Material Selection Processes: Why and How?," Perspectives in Reading Series, International Reading Association, Inc., Newark, Delaware, 1979, pp. 51-56.

The author emphasized the need for formal procedures in selection of materials for classroom use. These procedures needed to be written down and made available to the public. She further suggested that a philosophy of education be developed and presented to the public for examination also. To handle complaints, the author called for written and formal procedures before any definite action could be taken on any material. Most important, the author commented that the choice of materials to be used in the classroom should be fair to the overall population of the community in which the materials would be used.

Maxson, Marilyn M., and Kraus, Larry L., "Curriculum Censorship in the Public Schools," Education Digest, 45:2-5, November, 1979.

The authors of this article felt curriculum controversy could be healthy for American education if it were handled properly and treated as constructive criticism. They noted that most censorship attacks were not directed at the entire book or program, only selected portions. Educators needed to consider complaints against curriculum and materials and needed to use such criticism to improve schools. The authors felt that far too many educators had done nothing to prepare themselves for such attacks upon the schools and then overreacted when such attacks came. This led to a defensive posture by most educators. According to the authors, censorship controversy was not new. Controversy was the manner in which American education had traditionally developed.

Mour, Stanley I., "Censorship and the Schools: A Different Perspective," English Journal, 66:18-20, February, 1977.

The author did a study of Jefferson County, Kentucky and discovered that with the new court rulings teachers had some new problems to cope with. He recommended four steps for avoiding trouble:

1. Teachers needed to learn everything possible about the morals and values of the community they taught in.
2. Schools needed a formalized textbook selection procedure in writing and available to the public.
3. Definite procedures needed to be developed and used in handling censorship attempts and complaints.
4. Good public relations needed to be established between educators and the community.

If the schools did these simple things, Mour claimed that censorship would probably fade away.

National Council of Teachers of English Committee,
 "Censorship: Don't Let It Become an Issue in
 Your Schools," Language Arts, 55:230-242, February,
 1978.

This statement by the Committee gave their official view on censorship and how it should be dealt with. It was suggested that censorship came from a wide variety of sources and happened in an even wider variety of ways. It was suggested that there would have been far fewer controversies if teachers had selected their textbooks very carefully and taken into account the needs of the students of that particular community. It was also suggested that more attention needed to be given to the suitability of material for the students using it. The Committee stated the importance of already having written policies of educational philosophy, book selection procedures, and complaint procedures before complaints arose.

Ochoa, Anna S., "Censorship: Does Anybody Care?," Social Education, 43:304-309, April, 1979.

Ochoa presented her views on censorship in this speech given at the 58th Annual Meeting of the National Council for Social Studies in 1978. She warned that censors, such as the Gablers, had formed organized groups to further their cause, while the educational community had not yet formed any organized group to meet this challenge. As censors become more highly organized in the future, the author foresaw even greater pressure being put on the schools by these groups. The author stated that without the backing of some educational organization, many of the teachers in the future would practice widespread self-censorship in order to avoid facing the censors alone.

Riel, Arthur R., Jr., "Contrasting Views on Censorship," Educational Resources Information Center, ED 145 474, Speech delivered at the 28th annual meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Kansas City, Missouri, April 1, 1977, 8 pp.

Riel noted that educators and censors opposed each other philosophically. Educators tended to be humanists while censors tended to be theists. He argued that humanism was a religion just as theism was. He felt that the present dilemma could not be solved with the present school system because of these opposing philosophies. He advocated the development of a series of new schools with real differences in teaching philosophies in order to allow parents a real choice in their children's education. He felt that the battle over control of present schools would continue if nothing were done about the situation.

Shackford, Jane W., "Dealing with Dr. Doolittle: A New Approach to the 'isms'," Language Arts, 55:180-187, February, 1978.

This article concentrated on a new class of censors bent on protecting students from racism, sexism, and many other 'isms.' The author encouraged the selection of new books which did not show bias, or at least had balance. She did not agree with the banning of so many good books already on the shelves and in use in classrooms just because it might offend some group. She claimed that a good alternative to censorship would be to teach children to think critically about the works they read. Students could be taught to look at the ideas and issues in a book as well as the book's literary quality. The author was quite distressed because this obvious solution to the censorship problem had been ignored for so long.

Shugert, Diane P., "What Beginning English Teachers Need to Know About Censorship," English Education, 10:237-240, May, 1979.

The author wanted beginning teachers to be aware of the growing problem of censorship and suggested ways to prepare for such attacks. The teachers needed to prepare a written position on the students' right to read. Teachers needed to prepare a written statement on what was being taught. Teachers needed to be very familiar with school policies concerning complaints about materials. Finally, teachers needed to be aware of all the sources of help in case of a complaint, such as the American Library Association or the National Council of Teachers of English. These suggestions were made for beginning English teachers, but the author noted that it would be prudent for all teachers to do a little more preparation before a controversy arises.

Suhor, Charles, "Censorship and the Saber-toothed Gadfly," Media & Methods, 15:22-23, November, 1978.

The author of this article offered a new area of concern related to the censorship problem. He felt the media was doing more to aggravate many controversial situations than most people realized. In too many instances the media only inflamed an already touchy situation. Rather than allowing the media to continue in such a manner, Suhor called for teachers to become activists and to use the media before the media used them. He wanted the schools to go on a public relations campaign before any controversies arose in order to build public trust. He warned that inaction would only spur on the censors because they would feel a greater chance for success through wide media coverage. Suhor disliked sensational journalism and the effect it had on education.

Ward, Nancy, "Feminism and Censorship," Language Arts, 53:536-537, May, 1976.

In this article the author admitted becoming wary of the attempts by feminists and other groups to cleanse the schools of biased books. Her concern stemmed from the fact that this was an apparent movement toward censorship. She claimed that books were meant to show life in an accurate reflection and bias in either direction was wrong. She felt the schools should provide balance in their material. However, the author warned that censorship should not be used as a means to that end or the whole system of academic freedom could be endangered. She concluded that balancing curriculum and materials would be a simple and painless way for schools to lessen chances of censorship controversies.

SUMMARY

Research indicated a shift in censorship trends during the past decade. According to Yenser, censorship in the public schools was originally done out of a "protectionist" attitude. Hentoff noted that fundamentalist Christians were behind many of the censorship attempts. However, a new type of censorship rose during the 1970's which concerned many authors. Donelson and Massie pointed out the increasing number of right wing conservatives involved in censorship attempts. Massie was particularly concerned with the looming specter of political censorship. Gaines, Yenser, and Donelson all noted minority groups had begun attacking any books they perceived as biased against their ideals. Kamhi found that censors at the state level were organized groups, such as the Gablers. At the local level the censors tended to be individuals or church groups. Hentoff even went so far as to claim that everyone in society could be a potential censor.

In the controversy in Warsaw, Indiana, Jenkinson and Arons claimed fundamentalists were the first to attack both the textbooks and the curriculum. According to Hillocks, the fundamentalists in Kanawha County, West Virginia began the book protest there. However, Pearson discovered that the controversy in Enfield, Connecticut began when one mother went to school administrators with a few simple questions about one of the textbooks used.

The censors levelled a variety of complaints against school materials and curriculum. Segraves claimed secularism was the new religion being taught by the schools. Both Segraves and the Gablers wanted equal time for fundamentalist Biblical views to be presented in schools along with humanist views. Parker found that the Gablers were particularly opposed to the inquiry approach used by some teachers. Parker also noted the Gablers felt the only way to clean up society was to first clean up textbooks. Blee stated that schools had taken First Amendment rights too far and had failed to use good judgement in selecting materials. Glatthorn accused the schools of allowing a type of curriculum anarchy to take place, particularly in literature courses. Both Blee and Glatthorn criticized the schools for not selecting books which were truly appropriate to the classroom setting.

The ranks of educators and intellectuals who opposed censorship included the National Council for Social Studies. In a policy statement made in 1974, the NCSS maintained that both teachers and students had the right and the freedom to use the highest quality materials available. Jenkinson and Hung both claimed that censorship was really a result of social unrest rather than an indictment by the public against educational institutions. Jenkinson further suggested that parents often failed to even understand current materials or curriculum.

Too often the public misunderstood educators. Rhode claimed the public misunderstood the difference between secular humanism and the humanistic approach to teaching. Small complained that the public oftentimes did not even understand the very literature they protested against.

Farrell and Hatcher stated schools were attempting to produce rational thinking individuals. To accomplish this job, controversial materials which the censors attacked were quite necessary. Lettis and Miller both claimed that students had to read freely in order to achieve real growth. Lettis argued that no one had the right to stop students from reaching out for answers, while Miller noted that intellectual death could take place if students lost their freedom to read. Robinson attacked censorship calling it an attempt to make people pure by keeping them ignorant.

Some authors did agree that a qualified type of censorship was permissible. According to Jones and Jenkinson, parents did have the right to censor what their own children read, but those same parents did not have any right to censor what everyone else's children read. These authors felt that it was wrong to overstep the given rights each parent had over his or her children. This would be a violation of the First Amendment.

The courts have not been much help in clearing up the clouded issue of censorship in public schools. Rhode noted

that no concise path had been taken by the courts in any direction. Woods argued that the question of academic freedom in the public schools had only been partially addressed by the courts. According to Flygare and Edwards, courts began heading in a somewhat different direction in the last several years. Rather than considering the literary quality of the material in question in a given censorship case, the courts began ruling on who legally controlled the materials used in public schools. Flygare felt it was a good idea for the courts to remove themselves from the center of the educational process and leave local school boards control the schools. Edwards worried that without proper constraints inconsistent standards would be developed from one community to the next, leaving educators in a most uncertain position.

So much uncertainty left many educators concerned about future censorship in this country. The National Council of Teachers of English Committee, Ochoa, and Donelson all warned that unless changes were made soon, censorship would continue to increase. The NCTE Committee and Donelson called on teachers to prepare ahead of time for attacks on textbooks and curriculum. Ochoa wanted educational organizations to band together and meet the challenge of organized censors.

Jenkinson, Shugert, and Lohr all suggested schools needed to develop a written philosophy of education.

Written and formal materials selection procedures then needed to be developed and made public. Finally, written and formal procedures needed to be adopted for handling complaints about curriculum and materials. Hatcher wanted all concerned parties in the community to have input into curriculum decisions. Cox called for educators and the public to come together in some rational fashion when working on curriculum problems, rather than clashing irrationally as had been done in the past. Suhor, Jenkinson, and Arons all noted that the media often did a great deal to worsen already ugly controversies. Suhor suggested that educators use the media before the media had a chance to use them. Suhor, Mour, and Erickson called for a strong public relations campaign to keep the public well informed about the schools and materials used in the schools. They felt this would go a long way toward countering both the yellow press and censorship out of ignorance.

There were other suggestions made to counter censorship at the local level. Josten called for schools to select books appropriate to the students involved and to offer a variety of selections to assure every students' First Amendment rights. As an alternative to censorship, Shackford wanted students to learn to critically analyze the works used by the schools and not take those works at face value. Bull called on the courts to adopt his "truth standard" in order to please as many minority groups as

possible while still retaining good, factual classroom materials. Ward concluded that schools needed to balance curriculum by offering materials which presented both sides of controversial issues, such as sexism.

Burress saw censorship in a different light. Burress felt this was a sign that more people were becoming involved in the democratic processes of government. If the direction of this movement could be changed slightly, Burress felt it could contribute to the planning of future education. Maxson and Kraus suggested that controversies were not all bad. These authors felt that controversy and criticism had helped shape American education throughout its history. Finally, Riel claimed that public schools in their present form could not meet everyone's First Amendment guarantees. Under Riel's proposal, schools would be restructured so that some real differences in philosophy of education could be seen. This, according to Riel, would then give all parents, regardless of economic status, a real choice in their children's education.

CONCLUSIONS

The existing literature indicated that many of the censors came from conservative backgrounds, such as the fundamentalists. However, Donelson, Massie, and others found that a new group of censors had risen during the past decade. These new censors included minority groups and other special interest groups demanding schools present their point of view along with popularly held views, according to Parker and Segraves. Parker noted that some organized censors even went so far as to claim that cleaning up textbooks was the only way to clean up decadent society.

Educators and intellectuals attacked censorship attempts on the grounds that intellectual freedom was of utmost importance. Farrell and Hatcher defended the use of controversial materials as necessary tools to help students develop into rational thinkers. Lettis and Miller both claimed students must have the freedom to read or intellectual growth would cease to exist. Jenkinson and Jones both contended parents had the right to censor what their own children read, but had no right to censor what everyone else's children read.

The courts gave no real help on the question of censorship in the public schools. As Rhode pointed out, court decisions on censorship were mostly a game of chance. Edwards and Flygare noted the shift by the courts away from

the central issue of censorship to the tangent issue of who controlled the schools and school materials. Woods wanted the courts to address the question of academic freedom in public schools more directly in order to end much of the conjecture and controversy. This uncertainty left by the courts will not be of any comfort to educators of the future.

The literature indicated that the best thing educators could do was to prepare beforehand for censorship attempts. Jenkinson, Lohr, and Shugert suggested formal and written procedures for handling the selection of materials and any complaints about materials used in public schools. A strong public relations campaign by the schools was called for by Suhor, Mour, and Erickson. This powerful tool could help eliminate future censorship through ignorance.

Other suggestions were made for avoiding any future controversies over materials. Most of these involved the use of common sense by simply selecting the proper materials for the students who would use them or the use of the "truth standard" when judging textbooks to be certain that minority groups were getting a fair and truthful representation in textbooks. Riel even went a step further by suggesting schools be completely restructured to allow every parent the freedom of educating his or her child under the philosophy of the parent's choice.

Many authors made it clear that the clouded issue of censorship in public schools was far from decided. Many

authors, such as Erickson, Hatcher, and Jenkinson felt that the critical time period for censorship was being reached. With the courts giving no real indication of the direction they might take in the future, educators were left with a tremendous amount of uncertainty about the future of public education. However, as typified by Heisner, educators vowed that the struggle against censorship would continue.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that:

- 1.) Schools develop written philosophies of education.
These philosophies should be both general and specific justifying all the materials to be used in the classrooms.
- 2.) Schools develop formal, written materials selection procedures and make these procedures known to the public. These procedures should allow for public as well as professional input.
- 3.) Schools develop formal, written procedures for handling complaints about curriculum or materials. These procedures should be made public and should always be used in cases of complaints. No materials should be removed from the schools without following the prescribed process.
- 4.) Schools maintain communication with the public to keep the public informed about the schools and to receive input from the public on curricular decisions. This should always be a two-way communication.
- 5.) Individual teachers document any complaints received about materials and immediately inform their administrator of the complaint. Thorough documentation is extremely important in the case of a complaint and should be done by the administrators as well as the teachers.

- 6.) Educational organizations band together to meet the challenge of censorship in the schools. The Intellectual Freedom Committee is a good start, but further efforts to organize against censorship are needed to offset the organized censors.

Educators must keep constant watch over this situation until the present censorship crisis has ended. This appears to be the critical period for this censorship crisis. The outcome of the present crisis, one way or the other, will probably affect education for years to come.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arons, Stephen, "Bookburning in the Heartland," Education Digest, 45:11-14, December, 1979.
- Blee, Thomas J., "A Case for Censorship," Indiana English, 1:28-33, Fall, 1977.
- Bull, Barry L., "The Constitution, Liberal Theory, and Textbook Bias," The Educational Forum, 45:147-162, November, 1979.
- Burress, Lee, "Censorship and Cultural Conflict," Indiana English, 1:15-18, Fall, 1977.
- Cox, C. Benjamin, "The Censorship Game and How to Play It," Educational Resources Information Center, ED 143 570, National Council for Social Studies, Washington, D.C., 1977, 48 pp.
- "The Varieties of Censorial Experience: Toward a Definition of Censorship," High School Journal, 62:311-345, May, 1979.
- Cox, Gary, "Censorship: Tactics and Strategies," Indiana English, 1:5-7, Fall, 1977.
- Donelson, Ken, "Censorship Comes to Adolescent Literature," Indiana English, 1:10-14, Fall, 1977.
- "You Don't Need a Crystal Ball to Guess What's Going to Happen With Censorship," English Journal, 69:52-54, January, 1980.
- Edwards, June, "A New Twist to an Old Problem: Recent Court Decisions on School Book Censorship," English Journal, 70:50-53, March, 1981.
- "The Impact of Obscenity Legislation on Schools," The Educational Forum, 44:165-173, January, 1980.
- Erickson, Lawrence G., "Closing the Adversary Gap," Perspectives in Reading Series, International Reading Association, Inc., Newark, Delaware, 1979, pp. 42-46.
- Farrell, Edmund J., "Literature Crisis in the Schools," Education Digest, 46:56-58, April, 1981.

Flygare, Thomas J., "The Zykan Case: A Triumph for School Board Authority," Phi Delta Kappan, 62:279, December, 1980.

Gaines, Ervin J., "The New Censorship--Social Responsibility and Moral Righteousness," Indiana English, 1:23-27, Fall, 1977.

Glatthorn, Allan, "Censorship and the Classroom Teacher," English Journal, 66:12-15, February, 1977.

Hatcher, Thomas C., "Educational Directions in a Pluralistic Society," Perspectives in Reading Series, International Reading Association, Inc., Newark, Delaware, 1979, pp. 38-41.

"Indoctrinate or Educate: An Educational Perspective on the Use of Materials," Perspectives in Reading Series, International Reading Association, Inc., Newark, Delaware, 1979, pp. 7-13.

Heisner, J.D., "Censorship: The Fight Against It Goes On!," Instructor, 88:24-25, January, 1979.

Hentoff, Nat, "Censorship and the Schools," Learning, 9:78-81, March, 1981.

Hillocks, George, Jr., "Books and Bombs: Ideological Conflict and the Schools--A Case Study of the Kanawha County Book Protest," School Review, 86:632-654, August, 1978.

Hung, Pham Thien, "Parents Protest Textbooks," Educational Resources Information Center, ED 170 749, Freedom of Information Center, Columbia, Missouri, March, 1979, 12 pp.

Jenkinson, Edward B., "An Editorial: The Organized Censors Rarely Rest," Indiana English, 1:3-4, Fall, 1977.

Censors in the Classroom: The Mind Beniers, Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale, 1979, 184 pp.

"'Who Will Control the Minds of the Students' in Warsaw, Indiana?," Educational Resources Information Center, ED 168 067, Indiana Council of Teachers of English, Terre Haute, Indiana, November, 1978, 22 pp.

- Jones, Adrienne, "Values, Themes, and Censorship: The Writer's View," Perspectives in Reading Series, International Reading Association, Inc., Newark, Delaware, 1979, pp. 16-19.
- Josten, Monica L., "The Unlikely Censor," English Journal, 66:15-17, February, 1977.
- Kamhi, Michelle Marder, "Censorship vs. Selection---Choosing the Books Our Children Shall Read," Educational Leadership, 39:211-215, December, 1981.
- Lettis, Richard, "The Book is Not For Burning," Journal of Reading, 21:106-108, November, 1978.
- Lohr, Elaine, "Materials Selection Processes: Why and How?," Perspectives in Reading Series, International Reading Association, Inc., Newark, Delaware, 1979, pp. 51-56.
- Massie, Dorothy C., "Censorship in the Schools: Something Old and Something New," Today's Education, 69:56GE-60GE, November/December, 1980.
- Maxson, Marilyn M., and Kraus, Larry L., "Curriculum Censorship in the Public Schools," Education Digest, 45:2-5, November, 1979.
- Mikulecky, Larry, "Censorship and Reading Instruction," Reading Teacher, 33:4-6, October, 1979.
- Miller, Henry, "A Great Writer's View: Banning Books in Schools is 'Insane'," The American School Board Journal, 165:32-33, May, 1978.
- Mour, Stanley I., "Censorship and the Schools: A Different Perspective," English Journal, 66:18-20, February, 1977.
- "National Council for Social Studies Position Statement on the Freedom to Teach and the Freedom to Learn," Educational Resources Information Center, ED 143 570, National Council for Social Studies, Washington, D.C., 1977, 2 pp.
- National Council of Teachers of English Committee, "Censorship: Don't Let It Become an Issue in Your Schools," Language Arts, 55:230-242, February, 1978.
- Ochoa, Anna S., "Censorship: Does Anybody Care?," Social Education, 43:304-309, April, 1979.

- Parker, Barbara, "Your Schools May Be the Next Battlefield in the Crusade Against 'Improper' Textbooks," The American School Board Journal, 166:21-26, June, 1979.
- Pearson, Craig, "The Enfield Uproar: Criticism or Censorship?", Learning, 9:36-38, October, 1980.
- Rhode, Robert T., "Are Censors Confusing Humanism with Secular Humanism?", Indiana English, 1:56-61, Fall, 1977.
- "Legal Decisions and Censorship: A Game of Chance," Indiana English, 1:34-40, Fall, 1977.
- Riel, Arthur R., Jr., "Contrasting Views on Censorship," Educational Resources Information Center, ED 145 474, Speech delivered at the 28th annual meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Kansas City, Missouri, April 1, 1977, 8 pp.
- Robinson, Stephen, "Freedom, Censorship, Schools, and Libraries," English Journal, 70:58-59, January, 1981.
- Segraves, Nell J., "The Children of the Second Generation," Perspectives in Reading Series, International Reading Association, Inc., Newark, Delaware, 1979, pp. 32-37.
- Shackford, Jane W., "Dealing with Dr. Doolittle: A New Approach to the 'isms'," Language Arts, 55:180-187, February, 1978.
- Shugert, Diane P., "What Beginning English Teachers Need to Know About Censorship," English Education, 10:237-240, May, 1979.
- Small, Robert C., Jr., "And Then There Were None--Take It Away! I Don't Like It!," Language Arts, 54:244-249, March, 1977.
- Spiewak, Craig A., "Don't Think That the Censors Will Ignore Peaceful Valley High School," Indiana English, 1:62-71, Fall, 1977.
- Suhor, Charles, "Censorship and the Saber-toothed Gadfly," Media & Methods, 15:22-23, November, 1978.
- Ward, Nancy, "Feminism and Censorship," Language Arts, 53:536-537, May, 1976.

Webster's Seventh Collegiate Dictionary, G. and C. Merriam Company, Publishers, Springfield, Massachussetts, 1972, 1223 pp.

Woods, L.B., "Is Academic Freedom Dead in Public Schools?," Phi Delta Kappan, 61:104-106.

Yenser, Seymour, "Our Changing Censorship," Indiana English, 1:51-55, Fall, 1977.